

**Remarks**

Claims 1-69 and 78-83 are at issue in the present application, claim 71 having been canceled by this amendment and claims 70 and 72-77 having been allowed in the advisory action of October 12, 2004.

Applicants traverse the rejections of the claims at issue as anticipated by or obvious over Pawloski et al., Tanizaki et al., Phillips, and Komatsu et al.

Claims 1-69 and 78-83 have been amended to include, *inter alia*, that the portion of the second surface area includes sections of the thermoplastic ply and the cellulosic or tissue ply.

None of the cited references, alone or in combination, discloses or suggests a processing substrate including first and second layers wherein a portion of a surface area of the second layer is laterally disposed outside of a surface area of the first layer and wherein the portion of the second layer includes sections of the thermoplastic ply and the cellulosic or tissue ply, as recited by claims 1-69, and 78-83.

In fact, Pawloski et al. specifically discloses in FIGS. 8 and 9 an absorbent insert for food packages including a cooking surface disposed atop at least one layer of tissue wherein the cooking surface and tissue layers have the same surface area and apertures extend through at least the cooking surface. The insert further includes a plastic sheet disposed below the at least one layer of tissue, wherein the plastic sheet includes a surface area disposed outside a surface area of the cooking surface and tissue layer(s). Pawloski does not disclose a first layer secured to a second layer such that a portion of the surface area of the second layer is laterally disposed outside of the surface area of the first layer, wherein the second layer includes both a cellulosic or tissue ply and a thermoplastic ply. Instead, Pawloski (in FIG. 8) discloses a first layer having a cooking surface, an absorbent layer, and a paperboard layer and a second layer comprising a packaging film. At no point does Pawloski disclose that an absorbent layer may be added to the second layer. This feature of the second layer allows absorption of liquids that flow over the surface area of the first layer onto the second layer. Pawloski does not provide such an advantage.

Tanizaki et al. discloses a polypropylene composition including a resin comprising metallocene polypropylene including a copolymer of propylene and ethylene. The resin also optionally may comprise additives including, but not limited to, talc, calcium, magnesium, and antioxidants. Tanizaki et al. only discloses a polypropylene composition and, therefore, does not disclose a processing substrate having a two layer structure.

Phillips discloses a grease and moisture absorbing insert for microwave cooking including a first layer with a plurality of holes, a second absorbent layer, and a third bottom layer. All three layers are disclosed to be of the same size and shape. Phillips does not disclose a processing substrate including two layers each having two plies, nor does it disclose that one layer has a surface area that is disposed outside of a surface area of the other layer.

Komatsu et al. discloses a package containing an agent for retaining the quality of food kept therein. The package comprises an outer layer of a substantially gas-impermeable material, a first seal layer formed on an inner side of the outer layer, an inner layer formed on an inner side of the first seal layer, and a gas-permeable second seal layer formed on an inner side of the inner layer. Peripheral portions of the second seal layer are adhered to one another to form a sealed package. As with Phillips, Komatsu et al. does not disclose a processing substrate including one layer having a surface area that is disposed outside of a surface area of the other layer.

Because the prior art does not disclose each of the elements recited by the claims at issue, it follows that such claims are not anticipated thereby.

Further, because none of the prior art discloses or suggests that it would be desirable or even possible to provide a processing substrate as specified by the claims at issue, it is evident that the claims are not obvious thereover. The prior art must disclose at least a suggestion of an incentive for the claimed combination of elements in order for a *prima facie* case of obviousness to be established. See *In re Sernaker*, 217 U.S.P.Q. 1 (Fed. Cir. 1983) and *Ex Parte Clapp*, 227 U.S.P.Q. 972, 973 (Bd. Pat. App. 1985). Accordingly, the obviousness rejections should be withdrawn.

For the foregoing reasons, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the claims at issue and allowance thereof are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

McCracken & Frank LLP  
200 W. Adams,  
Suite 2150  
Chicago, IL 60606  
Telephone: (312) 263-4700  
Facsimile: (312) 263-3990

November 10, 2004  
Customer No. 29471

By: Erin J. Fox  
Erin J. Fox  
Reg. No: 52,261